

Appl. No. 10/717,726

Amdt. Dated November 9, 2006

Reply to Office Action of August 9, 2006

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NOV 09 2006

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the non-final Office action mailed August 9, 2006. Reexamination and reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks is respectfully solicited.

Claims 1, 4-20, and 22 are pending in this application, with claims 1, 7, 12, 16, 19, and 22 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 12-17, 19, and 22 have been amended, and claims 2, 3, 21, and 23 have been canceled. No new matter is believed to have been added.

Claims 1, 7, 12, 16, 17, 19, and 22 have been amended with additional elements to further define the claimed invention. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 7, 12, 17, 19, and 22 can be found, for example, in paragraph [0033] of the originally filed application. Support for the amendments to claim 16 can be found, for example, in FIG. 3 of the originally filed application.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,757,364 to Ozawa in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,772,274 to Dawson. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 1, 7, 12, 16, 19, and 22 are the independent claims.

Claim 1 recites “the logic storing the first background color in the A buffer background color column when displaying the second background color in the B buffer background color column, and displaying the first background color in the A buffer background when storing the second background color in the B buffer background color column.”

Dawson fails to even remotely suggest or disclose this element. Ozawa includes a “window type table” for background color information. However, the system in Ozawa double buffers the 8-bit frame number in the window type table and commands which frame number is active in the window type table loaded by the graphics bus. (Ozawa, col. 5, lines 19-30). Ozawa merely states that the window type table is “renewed,” but fails to disclose that the first background color in the A buffer background color column when

Appl. No. 10/717,726

Amdt. Dated November 9, 2006

Reply to Office Action of August 9, 2006

displaying the second background color in the B buffer background color column, and vice versa, as claimed in claim 1. In fact, it is likely that one skilled in the art would conclude that the system in Ozawa buffer swaps asynchronously to the readout. This is supported by col. 7, lines 22-40 of Ozawa, which states that an occasional (e.g., 1 in 256) clearing of the display plane by the rendering engine is required. In any event, Dawson and Ozawa, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose the elements of claim 1.

Independent claims 7, 12, 19, and 22 recite elements similar to that of claim 1 discussed above and are allowable over Ozawa and Dawson for the reasons stated above. Claims 4-6, 8-11, 13-15, and 20 variously depend from one of claims 1, 7, 12, and 19, and are allowable at least for that reason.

Independent claim 16 recites:

blending color data of a video with the at least one foreground pixel, upon determining that the video is in the background at a location of the foreground pixel; and

blending a background pixel with the at least one foreground pixel, upon determining that the video is not in the background at the location of the foreground pixel

wherein only one of the color data of the video and the background pixel is blended with the at least one foreground pixel.

Accordingly, claim 16 recites that either the video color data or the background pixel data is blended with the foreground pixel. Dawson is cited for disclosing video color data and background pixels. However, the system of Dawson blends both video color data and background pixel data with the foreground data. (see Dawson, e.g., FIG. 5).

Accordingly, claim 16 is allowable over Dawson and Ozawa. Claims 17 and 18 depend from claim 16 and are allowable at least as depending on an allowable claim. Claim 17 is additionally allowable for reciting features similar to that of claim 1 and discussed above.

Nov. 9, 2006 11:37AM INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ PC
Appl. No. 10/717,726
Amdt. Dated November 9, 2006
Reply to Office Action of August 9, 2006

No. 4667 P. 12
RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
NOV 09 2006

Conclusion

Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowance are requested.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

If for some reason Applicant has not paid a sufficient fee for this response, please consider this as authorization to charge Ingrassia, Fisher & Lorenz, Deposit Account No. 50-2091 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ

Dated: 11/09/06

By: Chad C. Anderson
Chad C. Anderson
Reg. No. 44,505
(480) 385-5060